DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 563 SP 030 733

AUTHOR Vogt, MaryEllen
TITLE The Preservice Teacher-Cooperating Teacher Relationship: An Historical Perspective.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (Toronto, Canada, May 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Influence; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This review of research on the influence of the cooperating teacher seeks to clarify the relationship between the preservice student teacher and the cooperating teacher, and to provide a better understanding of the student teaching experience. The expectations and the role of the cooperating teacher are reviewed and it is pointed out that, though the preponderance of research results supports the contention that the cooperating teacher has a profound influence on the preservice teacher, there are a number of studies that question this assumption. While changes have been noted in student teachers' attitudes from liberal toward authoritarian, it is suggested that this may be a result of being caught between the opposing viewpoints of the university and the school and not necessarily because of the influence of the cooperating teacher. A discussion is presented of the nature of the triadic relationship of cooperating teacher, student teacher, and university supervisor. An analysis is presented of research on the matching of the cooperating teacher and student teacher. Some conclusions and recommendations are offered and references are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301563 - -

The Preservice Teacher - Cooperating Teacher Relationship: An Historical Perspective

MaryEllen Vogt
University of California, Berkeley

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
International Reading Association
Toronto, Canada May, 1988

SP030733

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Vogt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Each school year across the country, thousands of idealistic, eager, young and not-so-young, prospective teachers begin teacher training programs at universities. Following their formal instruction, they enter the "real world" of the classroom where they begin what Pritchard (1974) has called the shortest apprenticeship period of any profession in which the purpose is "to transform a novice into an initiate" (p. 1). Since the 19th century when formal teaching preparation programs began, there has been great controversy as to what new teachers need to know, but there has been little argument about the necessity of student teaching, that period of time where the novice meets the students firsthand; most educators agree that this fieldwork experience is essential (Zeichner, 1980; Applegate & Lasky, 1982; Barrows, 1979; Griffin, 1981; Leslie, 1969; Silvernail & Costello, 1983).

John Dewey, in Experience and Education issued a caution about what has come to be the required fieldwork experience:

> The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other. For some experiences are miseducative. Any experience is miseducative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience (Erdman, 1983, p. 27).

That the student teaching experience for some is

beneficial and educative is not questioned; this is a time during which the student is able to construct a personal concept of what s/he perceives to be professional teacher behavior and many preservice teachers find their fieldwork experiences very meaningful (Zevin, 1974). But for others student teaching is what Templin calls "pedagogical schizophrenia" and what Locke labels "pedagogical madness" (Alvermann, 1981). The move from the theoretical perspective of the university classroom to the everyday realities of the teacher's life can cause a dissonance that can "wash out" the influence of the university training in as little as two days (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981; Alverman, 1981). Due in part to negative statements from classroom teachers regarding the practicality of university training, in part to working with students who may not represent the "ideal" student as invisioned by the preservice teacher, and in part to the rigors of keeping up with daily planning and organizing, the student teacher struggles to survive. The ideal teaching world gives way to the real world of the classroom, at least during this preservice period, and university training is often abandoned in favor of the "school of hard knocks".

As stated, the preservice teacher's chief concern is survival; Fuller and Brown, 1975, found that feelings of inadequacy, worries about security and independence, classroom control, and whether or not the students like them, predominate during student teaching (Karmos & Jacko, 1977).

Instead of coming out of the experience as mature practitioners, many preservice teachers complete their internship with lowered self-esteem, poor feelings about themselves in the role of teacher, and lowered expectations for students (Alverman, 1981). Further, Silvernail and Costello (1983) report on numerous studies which have found that at the end of the student teaching experience, preservice teachers exhibit more negative attitudes toward children than they did when they began their internship.

Preservice teachers themselves have complained that university teacher training provides an inadequate preparation for dealing with discipline problems and is too theoretical in perspective with insufficient practical application (Pataniczek & Isaacson, 1981). Whereas the university is attempting to teach the novice to be a thoughtful, imaginative, empathic, creative teacher, the outcome of the student teaching experience has often been a new teacher who is routinized, dogmatic, and authoritarian (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

Thus there appears to be a contradiction between the belief that the student teaching experience is essential for the beginning teacher and the results of research which are very critical of present practice (Zeichner, 1980). For teacher trainers the problem becomes how to create a partnership with the school which will create a teacher who is prepared for the realities of the classroom yet who is

sensitive, creative, eager, and supportive of students. Additionally, the dilemma becomes whether we should "prepare teachers for what exists in public schools or prepare them to alter what is" (Cuban, 1984, p. 263).

Zeichner (1980) identifies several "themes" that can be found in existing research on student teaching: the influence of the cooperating teacher; the influence of the "classroom's ecological environment"; the "conservative influence of the school bureaucracy"; and the "development of utilitarian teaching perspectives" (p. 47). For purposes of this paper, the issue of the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher will be examined.

Review of the Literature

To clarify the relationship between the preservice teacher and cooperating teacher and to better understand the nature of the student teaching experience, research on the influence of the cooperating teacher will be reviewed, the expectations and role of the cooperating teacher will be examined, the triadic relationship of cooperating teacher, university supervisor and preservice teacher will be discussed, and research on the matching of the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher will be analyzed.

Historical Perspective

In 1904, John Dewey outlined the function of practice teaching; his laboratory/apprenticeship approach has been used for past decades and some believe this approach

has turned out skilled technicians rather than thoughtful, sensitive teachers (Barrows, 1979). In the apprenticeship approach, the cooperating teacher is the model, and the preservice teacher, the helper. This type of relationship can result in a "miseducative experience" due to a lack of opportunities for the preservice teacher to reflect upon and analyze what s/he is doing (Erdman, 1983). Copas (1984) reports that Gage in 1978 noted a shift in focus during the student teaching experience from one of "knowing that" to one of "knowing how". This shift in focus resulted in the student teaching paradigm in use today whereby the preservice teacher receives "on-the-job-training", primarily with the cooperating teacher as the instructor and evaluator.

According to Bandura's Social Learning Theory, one learns from watching another model particular behaviors; the imitation of the modeled behaviors is a natural part of the learning process (Zimbardo, 1985; Copeland, 1978; Copeland, 1980). This modeling is perceived as giving the preservice teacher a sense of security and belonging, thereby reducing dissonance (McAulay as reported in Pritchard, 1974). Since the cooperating teacher is the person with whom the preservice teacher spends the most time, it is assumed through Social Learning Theory, that the cooperating teacher is responsible for teaching the preservice teacher the realities of the classroom. This is considered the "old"

model of the cooperating teacher, where this key person serves as a model to be emulated (Filburn, 1966-67). The preservice teacher from this perspective is seen as an empty vessel waiting to be filled "with the values, customs, and practices of the profession", and the central purpose of student teaching is for the preservice teacher to become assimilated (Zeichner, 1980, p. 46).

A "new" model as discussed by Filburn (1966-67), determines that the cooperating teacher will serve as a supervisor, a leader who will closely oversee the student teacher's activities. However, since the 1970's, another model has developed, a "partnership perspective", in which the preservice teacher and cooperating teacher work together; the preservice teacher is involved in trying alternative methods, creating his/her own lessons, examining the beliefs and methodology of the cooperating teacher and in formulating his/her own perspectives of teaching (Erdman, 1983; Easterly, 1977).

The majority of field-based studies that have examined the relationship between the preservice teacher and the cooperating teacher have focused on the process of socialization, of how the preservice teacher changes to reflect the attitudes, beliefs, and methodology of the cooperating teacher (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981; Zeichner, 1980). Many of these studies utilized pre-and post-analyses of the results of attitude measures such as the Minnesota

Teacher Attitude Inventory (Yee, 1969; Perrodin as reported in McIntyre & Morris, 1980), the Teacher Belief Inventory (Tabachnick et.al., 1982), or the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Pritchard, 1974). Others measured transfer of attitude through previously assessed classroom practices (Price, 1960) or transfer of verbal skills as measured by the Flanders Interaction Analysis profile (Pritchard, 1974). The conclusions drawn from these studies imply that the cooperating teacher is the primary socializing agent.

According to Doyle and Ponder, the classroom ecology must also be examined when looking at the relationship between the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher; "`that network of interconnected processes and events which impinges upon behavior in the teaching environment'" (Zeichner, 1980, p. 47; Zimpher, DeVoss, & Nott, 1980, p. 183; Copeland, 1980, p. 2). It is suggested that pre-and-post analyses are not enough when examining the relationship because of these classroom ecology factors, such as the management system, grading policy, and teaching strategies, which may contribute to or detract from the student teacher's acceptance of the cooperating teacher's way of conducting the classroom. The classroom environment, then, has been found to determine to a large extent the success or failure of the student teaching experience (Leslie, 1969).

Other researchers, however, have stated that the

socialization of the preservice teacher is the result of a triadic relationship rather than a dyadic one, with the university supervisor serving as the third important member of the team (Alvermann, 1981; Barrows, 1979; Boschee, 1978; Filburn 1966-67; Leslie, 1969; Zevin, 1974; Zimpher et.al, 1980; Griffin, 1981).

Over the years, all of these varied studies which have looked at the student teaching experience have arrived at differing conclusions; what are these conclusions and how do they relate to the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the preservice teacher?

Studies Supporting the Influence of the Cooperating Teacher

The vast majority of studies support the belief that the cooperating teacher has a significant impact upon the preservice teacher.

Yee (1969) declared the cooperating teacher to be "the most relevant variable operating in student teaching" (p. 327). After criticizing the methodology of other researchers who have found like results (McAulay, Price, Schueler, Gold & Mitzel, and Holeman), Yee administered the Minnesota Teacher Attitudes Inventory and found that both elementary and secondary student teachers' attitudes had shifted toward those of their cooperating teachers at the conclusion of the student teaching experience.

In reviewing major studies of the 1960's which dealt with the matching of the cooperating teacher to the

preservice teacher, Pritchard (1974) found that the cooperating teacher exerts a tremendous influence on the preservice teacher and the reported findings document that preservice teachers conform to the behavior and expectations of their cooperating teachers, whether for good or bad. This conformity may be because preservice teachers are fearful of receiving unfavorable evaluations from their cooperating teachers and are unwilling to try innovative ideas that do not conform to the cooperating teacher's belief system (Barrows, 1979; Pritchard, 1974).

Likewise, Bos:hee (1978) reports that the cooperating teacher moderately or greatly influences the preservice teacher, also stating that the stress of evaluation and the socialization of the schools leads preservice teachers to behave in a more conforming manner. Brodbelt and Wall (1985) state that while other teachers have the greatest influence on inservice teachers, the cooperating teacher is the most significant person for the preservice teacher. In this study, of 147 preservice teachers surveyed, 93% felt some degree of necessity to conform to their cooperating teachers.

Campbell and Williamson (1973) found that "success in student teaching is not contingent on the school to which the preservice teacher is assigned nor subject s/he is assigned to teach, but simply, the most important variable is the relationship between the preservice teacher and the

cooperating teacher to whom s/he is assigned" (p. 168). Additionally, they suggest that since the relationship between these two individuals is so critical, a compatible and harmonious relationship should be the goal of everyone involved.

The dominant influence in shaping the behavior of new teachers, then, appears to be the cooperating teacher (Silvernail & Costello, 1983; Zimpher, DeVoss, & Nott, 1980; Leslie, 1969; Copas, 1984; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Copeland, 1978; Pritchard, 1974). So strong is the influence of the cooperating teacher on the preservice teacher, that Zevin (1974) found that poor cooperating teachers will be imitated even over the university supervisor's objections. Specific teaching behaviors are adopted by preservice teachers and they can be observed in classroom performance (Price, 1960; Zevin, 1974; Seperson & Joyce, 1971). Transfer of these teaching behaviors may be somewhat mediated by the personal qualities of both the cooperating and preservice teacher, however (McIntyre & Morris, 1980). Further, when preservice teachers and cooperating teachers share common philosophies, are mutually supportive, and are similar in attitudes and methodology, the preservice teacher is more likely to have a successful student teaching experience; success is determined here in terms of socialization and enculturation (DeVoss as reported in Griffin, 1981).

Studies Questioning the Influence of the Cooperating Teacher

Though the preponderance of research results support the contention that the cooperating teacher has a profound influence on the preservice teacher, there are a number of studies that question this assumption. Copeland (1978) studied the use of microteaching techniques which were taught in teacher training programs. He found that a number of mediating influences, such as teacher-pupil ratio and district and school policies, determined whether or not the preservice teacher utilized new techniques or adopted those of the cooperating teacher. In particular, if the cooperating teacher also had been taught the microteaching techniques and they were already "in place" in the classroom ecology, the preservice teacher was far more likely to continue their use than if the cooperating teacher used other techniques. While not denying that the cooperating teacher influences the preservice teacher, Copeland maintains that other factors could be equally as significant (Zeichner, 1980).

McIntyre and Morris (1980) and Terwilliger (as reported by Griffin, 1981) state that preservice teachers do not model the verbal behavior of their cooperating teachers. Two separate studies by Flint in 1965 and Brown in 1967 (as reported in Seperson & Joyce, 1971) found that over the long term, preservice teachers also do not model their cooperating

teacher's instructional behaviors. Lortie, in his 1975 School Teacher, states that it is the student teacher's own biography, his/her own experiences from years as a student in classrooms, that best socializes the preservice teacher (Zeichner, 1980; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). "Formal training, including field-based experience, is seen as a 'low impact enterprise' which plays little part in altering earlier and conservative ideas about teaching" (Zeichner, 1980, p. 49).

At this point, it is important to mention once again that as long as the cooperating teacher is in the role of evaluator, many preservice teachers will attempt to model the cooperating teacher's behaviors simply to obtain a satisfactory grade. Further, when an idealistic preservice teacher attempts innovative techniques and these are met with the opposition of the cooperating teacher, more often than not, the preservice teacher will abandon the novel ideas in favor of conforming to the cooperating teacher's ways (Griffin, 1981)

A number of studies have reported problems encountered by both preservice teachers and cooperating teachers, and most of these deal with differences in expectations. Cooperating teachers want preservice teachers who come to them committed to teaching, not wondering if the career will be the right one for them. Many want a partnership with the

preservice teachers and do not wish to be totally responsible for evaluation. They want enthusiastic, professional, well-organized, and knowledgable individuals as preservice teachers. Many cooperating teachers see the university teaching and encouraging skill development and practice; the cooperating teachers often expect skill proficiency (Applegate & Lasley, 1982). Such differences in expectations lead to miscommunication and misunderstanding.

Additionally, some cooperating teachers believe that their classes should be taught by the preservice teacher exactly the way they teach them; the preservice teacher perceives a sense of competition with the cooperating teacher when in this situation and believes s/he is unwilling to let the preservice teacher take control of the classroom. Once again, a "failure in human relations", as seen through miscommunication, results (Campbell & Williamson, 1973). Southall & King, in 1979, report that a lack of communication and unrealistic expections of the cooperating teacher were the most frequently cited problems during the student teaching experience (O'Neal, 1983; Griffin, 1981). Castillo, 1971, states additional problems include an inadequate chance to maintain close interaction, differences in personal characteristics and backgrounds, and unclear, poorly defined expectations for both roles.

Transfer of Attitude Studies

A number of studies have dealt specifically with the

change in attitude that occurs in preservice teachers during their student teaching experience. Though Boschee, Prescott, and Hein (1978) found through pre-and post-analysis that there were not attitude changes during student teaching, findings that directly contradict Yee (1969), other studies have found that attitudes merge toward those of the cooperating teacher (Price, 1960; McIntyre & Morris, 1980; Seperson & Joyce, 1971; Zeichner, 1980; Pritchard, 1974). Corrigan and Griswold (1963) report that degree of attitude change may depend upon the particular cooperating teacher; some students of certain supervisors show more change than students of other supervisors. When cooperating teachers are considered to be "above average" teachers, more attitudinal change results in their preservice teachers, than with the preservice teachers of the "below average" group.

Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) found that students tend to become more progressive or liberal during university studies and then shift to opposing views during student teaching, though this shift is viewed as a result of being caught between the opposing viewpoints of the university and the school and not necessarily because of the influence of the cooperating teacher. Though Pritchard reports that Young found preservice teachers move toward less authoritarianism during the pre-service experience, Theis-Sprinthall (1980) states that "preservice teachers become more authoritarian,

less flexible, less responsive to pupils, and more rigid in their classroom behavior" during student teaching (p. 17). Silvernail and Costello (1983) and Griffin (1981) report on a number of studies which show that preservice teachers exhibit more negative attitudes toward students and teaching in general following student teaching. Due to the overwhelming number of studies which support the impact of the cooperating teacher upon the preservice teacher, it is difficult not to at least wonder about a causal relationship when looking at the more negative attitudinal change data. Is the cooperating teacher responsible in part for negative attitude changes or is the entire student teaching experience responsible?

Studies Dealing with the Triadic Relationship

Up to this point, this paper has focused on research dealing with the influence of the cooperating teacher on the preservice teacher. In order to more clearly understand this relationship, it is also necessary to look at the role of the university supervisor to determine his/her level of influence on the student teacher's field work experience.

Earlier, Doyle and Ponder's definition of the ecological system working within the classroom was discussed. Zimpher, DeVoss, and Nott (1980) state that the relationship of the university supervisor to the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher is an example of how this ecological system can operate; of how one of the factors can impinge

upon the success of the preservice teacher and the transfer of teaching behaviors from one to the other. In a longitudinal study, they found that the university supervisor serves a very important function: that of preventing the preservice teacher from replicating what the cooperating teacher does without reflection or analysis as to why he/she is doing so. As a buffer between the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher, the supervisor can also mediate problems by serving as a confidant for both parties, reinforcing university training that cooperating teachers occasionally sabotage, and complimenting, rather than competing with the cooperating teacher's role (Zimpher, DeVoss, & Nott, 1980; Alvermann, 1981).

Since the university supervisor has the ultimate responsiblity in most teacher training programs for giving the letter grade for student teaching, the preservice teacher might be able to look at the cooperating teacher less as an evaluator and as more of a helpmate (Alvermann, 1981). Barrows (1979) sees the power imparted to the person in the triad who is the evaluator; usually, she states this is the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor wields less power as s/he accepts the evaluation from the cooperating teacher. The preservice teacher is seen as the least powerful of the three, and according to Barrow, is sometimes viewed as a "helpless victim". Likewise, Leslie (1969)

states that the cooperating teacher has a greater impact than the supervisor. This influence appears to depend, in part, upon the amount of actual contact between the university supervisor and the preservice teacher.

As to how the triad functions, the research yields mixed results. Grimmet and Ratzlaff (1986) report the triad shows little evidence of working together toward common goals while Filburn (1966-67) states that student teaching is more successful when the preservice teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor work together as a team. When the team does not function effectively, the preservice teacher often feels caught in between the school and the university and tension results (Zevin, 1974). When there is concurrence, especially in teaching methodology and philosophy, the student teacher is likely to conform less, experiment more with innovative ideas, and reflect and analyze practices (McIntyre & Morris, 1974; Zevin, 1974). Griffin (1981) reports the work of Morris in 1974 and Smith in 1969 which found that changes in frequency, or elimination of contact with the university supervisor, brought about greater preservice teacher satisfaction.

Matching Preservice Teachers with Cooperating Teachers

Brodbelt notes that the selection of cooperating teachers is one of the least researched areas of the student teaching program (Griffin, 1981). Often, cooperating teachers simply volunteer for the position and student

teachers are assigned to them only on the basis of subject area. Leslie (1969) conducted an ambitious study of student teacher-cooperating teacher matching based on the premise that careful selection and matching of the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher will result in improved student teaching performance. His findings determined that matching along philosophical and demographic lines does not improve student teaching performance; in fact, he theorized that preservice teachers who are mismatched may work harder and perform better than those with whom close matches seem apparent. He suggests that a sense of "cognitive dissonance", whereby the individual works to overcome disequalibrium, might be a desirable feature when assigning preservice teachers to cooperating teachers (Leslie, 1969; Pritchard, 1974; Griffin, 1981).

Others have suggested that a close matching of preservice teachers and cooperating teachers is preferable, the assumption being that if there is philosophical and methodological agreement, there will be more effective interaction (Griffin, 1981). Specifically, McIntyre and Morris (1980) suggest that questionnaires, personality and attitude tests and subsequent matching based on the results, might reduce tension and enhance learning, while Zevin (1974) believes observations and analyses of interactional patterns should precede assignment. Erdman (1983) suggests placing hesitant preservice teachers with strong, reflective teachers

who are able to clearly explain why they do what they do. Likewise, confident preservice teachers might function more effectively with cooperating teachers who provide little feedback and direction.

Most important, a pool of potential cooperating teachers should be formed and assignment of preservice teachers should be made through mutual agreement. The possibility for successful partnerships is greatly enhanced when arbitrary or random selection of student teacher-cooperating teacher dyads is eliminated (Erdman, 1983; Easterly, 1977; Zevin, 1974).

The Role of the Cooperating Teacher

If the cooperating teacher is so important to the success of the preservice teacher, it might be assumed that the nature of the position is clearly defined in the literature, at the university, and in the schools. However, though a review of the research on the role of the cooperating teacher suggests that there is a variety of tasks that are expected of the cooperating teacher, there is disagreement as to how this role should be deliniated.

Barrows (1979) reports that the cooperating teacher is quite powerless, has little say as to the selection and evaluation of the preservice teacher, receives very little monetary remuneration, and may not even meet the university supervisor until the preservice teacher is already in the school. At this point in the process, Painter and Weiner

(1979) suggest that the cooperating teacher simply gives a cursory look at the forms and other university materials, files them away, and begins the "partnership" with one of three attitudes: that the preservice teacher should become his/her carbon copy; that the preservice teacher is there to enable the teacher to have more free time; or that the preservice teacher has been assigned by the principal because of the teacher's own inadequacies. The cooperating teacher then becomes the student teacher's "mentor, judge, and father confessor"; after this close relationship, s/he is expected to grade the novice, tends to overlook mistakes, and often inflates the final evaluation (Junell, 1969, p. 256; Phelps, Schmitz, & Wade, 1986).

Of course this scenario is not typical in all schools or student teaching experiences. Grimmet and Ratzlaff (1986) conducted a study on preservice teacher expectations of the cooperating teacher's role in Canada and compared it with the findings of American studies by Castillo (1971) and Copas (1984). Across the years and in both countries, they found that cooperating teachers are expected to orient the preservice teacher to the school, introducing him/her to other staff; to teach preservice teachers skills of presentation and classroom management; to encourage preservice teachers to become professionally involved in teaching; to present opportunities for the preservice teachers to learn and experiment; to provide resource

materials and information basic to student teaching; to assist with planning for and evaluating student learning; and to give detailed feedback during observations and conferences.

Additional responsibilities include providing the preservice teacher with personal support (Karmos & Jacko, 1977) while fostering a climate of acceptance by students and staff; directing student questions to the preservice teacher; giving limited responsibilities as soon as possible upon the student teacher's arrival; and assisting with analyzing student discipline problems (Garner, 1971). The cooperating teacher should be flexible (O'Neal, 1983), and should be able to "sense" how the preservice teacher is feeling; predicting when criticism is needed and allowing mistakes to be made occasionally (Filburn, 1966-67).

In a survey of 300 preservice teachers, over 700 expectations of cooperating teachers were categorized by Farbstein (1965). In addition to many of those expectations stated above, the following were included: allowing the preservice teacher to participate in parent/teacher activities; possessing an adequate knowledge of subject material; being aware of preservice teacher needs; being pleasant; controlling one's temper; being willing to treat the preservice teacher as an equal; and showing an interest in the preservice teacher as a human being.

Innacone, in 1963, studied aspects of the teacher socialization process. He was most interested in how student teachers' perceptions of their cooperating teachers change during the course of a semester-long student teaching placement. He found that at first, preservice teachers register indignation and even "horror" at their cooperating teachers' classroom behaviors; these feelings occur during an "entry stage" in which the preservice teachers serve as observers. Once the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher form a collaborative relationship, a "transition stage" occurs; during this time, the relationship is still superordinate-subordinate in nature. Finally, the preservice teacher usually becomes more closely aligned with the cooperating teacher as his/her perspective toward discipline, methods, and learning come to resemble the cooperating teacher's (Griffin, 1981).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The preceding literature review indicates that the influence of the cooperating teacher on the preservice teacher is profound, that successful matches may depend on attitude, philosophy, methodology, and communication, and that for preservice teachers and cooperating teachers alike, the success of the student teaching experience and satisfaction of those involved, can depend upon many factors. Most recently, research focusing on how preservice teachers

learn to teach has indicated that prior knowledge and beliefs may be one such important factor to consider; because a preservice teacher's private beliefs may be different from professed beliefs, due to the fact that the novice is in a student teaching situation, the professed beliefs may do more to mediate instructional decisions than private beliefs, thus pleasing the cooperating teacher. Whether the preservice teacher's private beliefs guide instructional decisions during the first year of teaching is currently being investigated (Hollingsworth, 1988).

At this point, it appears that additional research also might focus on the issue of student teacher-cooperating teacher compatibility (Boschee, Prescott & Hein, 1978); if attitude and beliefs instruments do not appear to provide for satisfactory "matches", then perhaps a look at personal characteristics, that sense of "this is the preservice teacher/cooperating teacher for me" must be investigated. Campbell and Williamson, 1973, suggest an "open-mindedness" survey should be developed so that potential cooperating teachers could be assessed for qualities of cooperation, sensitivity, and understanding prior to matching them with their preservice teachers. Boschee, Prescott, and Hein (1978) believe that future research should focus on determining the effect of the cooperating teacher's years of experience, openness, flexibility, and affective awareness. Further, they suggest that universities should work to

provide philosophical matches between preservice teachers and cooperating teachers, though they give no clue as to how this should be accomplished.

Theis-Sprinthall (1980) suggests that there is a need for the professional and psychological development of cooperating teachers so that unproductive matches do not occur. Yet, Leslie (1969) indicates that cognitive dissonance might enhance performance and that searching for the perfect match is not the answer. Perhaps the key to student teaching effectiveness lies in the ability of the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher to communicate, to conference, and to share; training in effective communication might enhance the working relationship (O'Neal, 1983). Or it may be that we just need to more carefully screen potential cooperating teachers (Campbell & Williamson, 1973)--yet how should that screening take place? Silvernail and Costello (1983) further suggest that additional student teaching time might be beneficial, yet Tabachnick, et.al. (1982), argue that more field work time is not the answer.

One recommendation that researchers on cooperating teachers and preservice teachers agree upon is the need for training programs for the cooperating teachers (Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Painter & Weiner, 1979; Zevin, 1974; Castillo, 1971; McIntyre & Morris, 1980; Griffin, 1981). There have been few conclusive reports on how such training programs should operate or on their

effectiveness. Copeland (as reported in Griffin, 1981), found that in classrooms where cooperating teachers had received training, preservice teachers felt more comfortable trying new techniques and ideas. Without other definitive findings, at least there is agreement that training programs should be developed.

Karmos and Jacko (1977) recommend that cooperating teachers should be trained in interpersonal skills, counseling, and conferencing; that they be made aware of their impact and be given time to conference with their preservice teachers. Additionally, curricular materials to assist the cooperating teacher should be developed which will merge the professional abilities of the cooperating teachers with the goals and expectations of the university training program (Applegate & Lasley, 1982). Painter and Weiner (1979) recommend that innovative inservice programs be developed "at a minimum expense of time and personnel and they see that attitudes, a poor selection process of cooperating teachers, and a lack of university funding are the biggest roadblocks to successful student teaching programs" (p. 13).

The North Carolina State Department of Education has developed a one unit, free, voluntary course for prospective cooperating teachers. This begins with a social get-together with university personnel, preservice teachers, principals

and interested teachers and it occurs before cooperating teachers are asked to sign commitments. Thereafter, conferences are held, cooperating teachers are invited to sit in on university methodology classes, various mailings on the student teaching program are distributed, and eventually, a two-unit voluntary course is offered to cooperating teachers. This has been met with enthusiasm by university and school personnel alike (Painter & Weiner, 1979).

Castillo (1971) suggests that conferences, seminars, and discussions for cooperating teachers should develop clarity and consensus on the roles of the preservice teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. Handbooks should be developed that contain specific statements regarding expectations and these should be cooperatively prepared by representatives from the university and the schools. Training should include innovations in teacher education as well as supervision techniques; McIntyre and Morris (1980) would add that this supervisorial training would enable the university supervisor to spend more time with preservice teachers who are experiencing difficulty. Additionally, it is suggested that cooperating teachers receive more recognition and greater remuneration for their work.

Castillo recommends that future research concentrate on the similarities and differences in role expectations between those in urban, suburban, and rural school districts.

Zeichner (1980) cautions that further research should incorporate quantitative as well as qualitative and ethnographic research techniques; that there is a tendency to look at only the social and anthropological perspectives at this time and to avoid the quantitative methods which might yield important results. He suggests that both methods together will result in information which may be more powerful collectively than either method will yield individually.

In California, there is a predicted teacher shortage at this time which may indicate new problems with student teaching programs. Particularly, many second career, "re-entry" students are being admitted to the fifth year credential programs. Perhaps they will have special needs; many have spent twenty or twenty-five years in other careers: the military, police work, the business field, or related areas. What are their special needs? Will they be receptive to student teaching techniques and strategies that have worked in past decades? Will they identify with "career" teachers who have been in the field for a number of years and will they accept these teachers as their cooperating teachers? Likewise, will experienced cooperating teachers relate to these novice teachers in the same manner as they have previously with younger preservice teachers? Might this new crop of teachers already arrive with set notions about

education, about the way "things should be" and find it difficult to work within the present classroom ecology? These questions might yield interesting research findings that could have implications for the design of training programs for both preservice teachers and cooperating teachers.

Another issue that warrants further research deals with the question of the influences of the cooperating teacher on the preservice teacher. Though the preponderance of research declares that there is a powerful influence of the one on the other, the nature of these influences has not been defined. What actual attitudes, skills, and methods of the cooperating teacher are manifested in and demonstrated by the preservice teacher during a classroom lesson? Are the cooperating teacher's suggestions, reinforcements, and corrections "taken to heart" and can they be seen during actual teaching? Answers to these questions could further define the relationship between the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher, and could assist teacher educators in the writing of training programs for cooperating teachers.

Obviously, though field work experiences have been in existence for decades for novice teachers, there are many unanswered questions about the efficacy, impact, and overall importance of student teaching. Even with general agreement that the relationship between the cooperating teacher and preservice teacher is vital to the student teacher's success,

there are many issues which remain controversial and which merit further research. As a result of this research and in partnership with the schools, teacher trainers at the universities can perhaps design and implement programs for both preservice teachers and cooperating teachers which will be more effective for the preservice teachers, more sensitive to the cooperating teachers, and ultimately, most beneficial for their students.

REFERENCES

Alvermann, D.E. (1981). The possible values of dissonance in student teaching experiences. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 24-25.

Applegate, J.H. and Lasley, T.J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (2), 15-18.

Barrows, L. (1979). Power relationships in the student teaching triad. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ED 173335)

Boschee, F., Prescott, D.R. and Hein, D. (1978). Do cooperating teachers influence the educational philosophies of student teachers? Journal of Teacher Education, 29 (2), 57-61.

Brodbelt, S. and Wall, R. (1985). Student-teacher socialization: role model influences. Paper presented at the Eastern Education Research Association Conference, Virginia Beach, Virginia. (ED 264225).

Campbell, L.P. and Williamson, J.A. (1973). Practical problems in the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationships. Education, 94 (2), 168-169.

Castillo, J.B. (1971). The role of expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1374.

Copas, E.M. (1984). Critical requirements for cooperating teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (6), 49-54.

Copeland, W.D. (1978). Processes mediating the relationship between cooperating teachers' behavior and student teacher classroom performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 95-100.

Copeland, W.D. (1980). Student teachers and cooperating teachers: an ecological relationship. Theory into Practice, 18, 194-199.

Corrigan, D. and Griswold, K. (1963). Attitude changes of student teachers. The Journal of Educational Research, 57 (2), 93-95.

Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1980. Longman.

Easterly, J. (1977). Mutual-choice placement: a humanisitic approach to student teaching assignments. Rochester, Michigan. (ED 194454)

Erdman, J. (1983). Assessing the purposes of early field experience programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (4), 27-31.

Farbstein, M. (1965). Critical requirements for cooperating teachers: a study of cooperating teachers as perceived by student teachers in the state of New Jersey. Dissertation Abstracts International. 25, 3991.

Filburn, E. (1966-67). Student teaching: whose responsibility? The growing edges of secondary English (Suhor, C. et.al., editors). Champaign, Illinois: NCTE. (ED 026378).

Garner, A. (1971). The cooperating teacher and human relations. Education, 92 (2), 99-106.

Griffin, G.A. et.al. (1981). Student teaching: a review. University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Grimmet, P.P. and Ratzlaff, H.C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (6), 41-50.

Hollingsworth, Sandra (1988). The Cooperating Teacher, Preservice Teacher and University Supervisor: What's Expected from Prservice Teacher Education? Unpublished manuscript. University of California, Berkeley.

Hollingsworth, Sandra (1987). Making field-based programs work: A three-level approach to reading education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, Anaheim, CA

Junell, J.S. (1969). Abolish letter grades for student teaching activities. Education, 89, 255-256.

Karmos, A.H. and Jacko, C.M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28 (5), 51-55.

Leslie, L.L. (1969). Improving the student teaching experience through selective placements of students.

Final report of Grant No. OEG-8-9-540015-2019(058), U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (ED 034718).

McIntyre, D. and Morris, W. (1980). Research on the student teaching triad. Contemporary Education, 51 (4), 193-196.

O'Neal, S. (1983). An analysis of student teacher-cooperating teacher conferences as related to self-concept, flexibility, and teaching concerns of each participant. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. (ED 234030).

Painter, L.H. and Weiner, W.K. (1979). Developing competent cooperating teachers. Improving College Education and University Teaching, 27 (1), 13-15.

Pataniczek, D. and Isaacson, N. (1981). The relationship of socialization and concerns of beginning secondary teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 14-17.

Phelps, L., Schmitz, C., and Wade, D. (1986). A performance-based cooperating teacher report. Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (5), 32-35.

Price, R.D. (1960). Relations between cooperating teachers and student teachers' attitudes and performances. Dissertation Abstracts, 21, 2615.

Pritchard, E.F. (1974). Matching student teachers with cooperating teachers: a review of the literature. (ED 087759)

Seperson, M.A. (1971). The teaching styles of student teachers as related to the teaching styles of their cooperating teachers. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City. (ED 051080).

Silvernail, D. and Costello, M. (1983). The impact of student teaching and internship programs on preservice teachers' pupil control perspectives, anxiety levels, and teaching concerns. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (4), 32-36.

Tabachnick, B., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., and Egan, K. (1982). The impact of the student teaching experience on the developement of teacher perspectives. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City. (ED

218251).

Theis-Sprinthall, L. (1980). Supervision: an educative or miseducative process? Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (4), 17-20.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 60 (4), 327-332.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (6), 45-55.

Zeichner, K. and Tabachnick, B. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 7-11.

Zevin, J. (1974). In the cooperating teacher's image: convergence of social studies student teachers' behavior patterns with cooperating teachers' behavior patterns. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ED 087781).

Zimbardo, P.G. (1985). Psychology and life. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

Zimpher, N.L., deVoss, G.G. and Nott, D.L. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (4), 11-15.